Claim Status

Claims 1-4, and 6-25 were pending in the application, and claim 5 had been cancelled. Claims 1, 6, 7, and 20 have been rewritten. The subject matter of claim 5 had been added to independent claims 1, 7, and 20. Claims 1-4, and 6-25 remain in the application.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-4, 6-13, and 16-25 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Bottan et al (US pub. no. 2002/0042846) in view of Timm et al. (US pub. 2002/0042846)

Applicant has amended independent claims 7 and 20 to indicate that the emergency contact list is retrieved from the remote wireless device upon receiving the request for emergency services, as taught on page 14, section 0046, and in FIG. 5 of the instant specification. Bottan, as described on page 3, section 0032, stores subscriber information on a web database.

Bottan describes a personal support network, which allows a user to store a variety of user information on a server. Upon the occurrence of an event, the user's wireless device transmits an event message 114 to the support network. The support network evaluates the message using rules 110 and decides whether or not to notify the indicated people. That is, the notification goes out when the user, or other party, contacts the support network in Bottan.

Applicant's claimed invention is distinct from Bottan since retrieval of the contact to be notified is conditioned upon requesting emergency services. Once the request is made, then the emergency contact list is retrieved. Retrieval of the contact information may be performed by accessing a database, or by retrieving it from the remote wireless device by the processing center 132. The Rejection contends that Bottan shows receiving a request for emergency services at section 0026. What is described at that section, however, is that the device can issue a notification message to the support network. The notification message may be sent in response to an emergency situation, but it is not itself a request for emergency services. Bottan therefore shows elements similar to Applicant's retrieving a list and sending notification messages, but according the claim structure of Applicant's claims, the request for emergency services is a separate step; a step not described or shown by Bottan.

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 2 0 2006**

Docket No. CE11883JSW

Thus the combination of Bottan and Tim does not render Applicant's claims obvious as Neither Bottan nor Timm show requesting emergency services as a separate step which subsequently triggers the notification process. Accordingly, Applicant believe claims 1, 7, and 20 are allowable over Bottan in view of Tim. Furthermore, the remaining claims, being ultimately dependent on one of claims 1, 7, or 20, are likewise allowable.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee due, or credit any overpayment, to Motorola, Inc., Deposit Account Number 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

By: _____

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department – MD 1610
8000 W. Sunrise Blvd.
Plantation, FL 33322
Customer Number: 24,273

Scott M. Garrett
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 39,988

Telephone:954-723-6449
Fax No.: 954-723-5599

8